

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 remain for reconsideration. Claims 21-47 have been previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 1 has been amended merely to correct a minor antecedent error. No new matter has been added.

By way of procedural background, the present application has had numerous Office Actions since the year 2000, has been up on appeal, and now this is the second non-final Office Action after Appeal.

It is Applicants hope that after seven years within the Patent Office, the Examiner has done a thorough search and this case will move forward.

A new ground of rejection was set forth in the previous Office Action rejecting all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,430,174 to Jennings.

This rejection was traversed, without amendment, and that rejection withdrawn. Now the Examiner has come back with yet more new art and has rejected all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jennings, as above, further in view of USP 6,496,571 to Wilson. Again, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Briefly, embodiments of the present invention are generally directed to systems and methods for authenticating the identity of a second user or caller to a first caller conversing on telephone through a media gateway. As discussed for example on page 27, lines 17-20, embodiments of the present invention are used for “enabling the provision of authentication or identification services to an end-user regarding a caller during or on a call” (emphasis added). As further discussed, for example at page 29, lines 1-4, “...the client device 28 receives a request to “remote authenticate”. For example, the request may be initiated by the Authenticator invoking the authentication feature on his/her client device, such as by speaking a voice command or dialog command into a dialog system or a dialog management module” (emphasis added).

Thus, according to embodiments, a caller, during a call, may authenticate the caller on the other end of the line simply by speaking a voice command during the call.

Independent claims 1 as previously amended recites:

“... establishing a telephone call between the first user and the second user through a media gateway;

detecting a voice command from the first caller during the telephone call;

requesting a certificate corresponding to the second user from an authentication server in response to the voice command...” (emphasis added).

Similarly, independent claim 11 recites “... in response to a voice command of the first user requesting authentication of the second user, is configured to receive a certificate corresponding to the user of the second client device and the authentication certificate from the authentication server and being configured to authenticate the user of the second client device...” (emphasis added).

In the present Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Jennings does not teach “*detecting a voice command from a first user*” and has therefore cited Wilson. In particular, Wilson has been applied in combination with Jennings for the sole purpose of teaching a “voice command”. To that end, the Examiner has cited columns 2, lines 8-10, 12-17, and 22-25. This passage, or anywhere else in Wilson, has nothing to do with allowing a first user to speak a voice command to authenticate a second user, as claimed.

This passage from Wilson states:

*“... information from the caller. In the case of obtaining voiceprint information, a telephone microphone converts the voice of the caller to electrical audio signals and the automatically obtaining means responds to the electrical audio signals to produce corresponding voiceprint information associated with the caller. The fingerprint information is*

*transmitted to a fingerprint database and the voiceprint information is transmitted to a voiceprint database. The fingerprint information is compared with fingerprint data in the fingerprint database to personally identify the caller associated with the fingerprint information. The voiceprint information is compared with voiceprint data in a voiceprint database to personally identify the caller associated with the voiceprint information. Preferably, a local switch servicing the called telephone includes at least one of the fingerprint database and the voiceprint database*" (emphasis added).

Hence, this system appears to use a combination of finger print data and voice print data to authenticate a caller. However, the system of Wilson, does not perform this authentication in response to a voice command from the other caller. No voice command is ever spoken from the other party in this system. In fact no voice "command" is spoken at all. Thus, the combination of Jennings and Wilson still do not teach or suggest the claim language "... in response to a voice command of the first user requesting authentication of the second user" as recited in the claims. Thus, this combination once again does not show *prima facie* obviousness and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it requested that the application be reconsidered, that claims 1-20 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to Intel's Deposit Account number 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

*/Kevin A. Reiff/*

Kevin A. Reiff  
Reg. No. 36,381

INTEL  
LF2  
4040 Lafayette Center Drive  
Chantilly, Virginia 20151  
(703) 633-6834